UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,953	06/12/2006	Tomas Fabo	1501-1317	9965

466 7590 05/19/2009

YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
ORWIG, KEVIN S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1611	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/553,953	FABO, TOMAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin S. Orwig	1611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Mar. 16, 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-8, 17, and 18* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9-16,19 and 20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendments and arguments filed Mar. 16, 2009 are acknowledged and have been fully considered. Claims 9, 11, and 19 are amended; claims 1-8, 17, and 18 are withdrawn. Claims 1-20 are currently pending.

OBJECTIONS/REJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

The objection to claim 11 is withdrawn in light of the claim amendments.

The rejection of claims 11-13, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph is withdrawn in light of the claim amendments.

OBJECTIONS/REJECTIONS MAINTAINED

The rejection of claims 9, 10, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over GUYURON is maintained as discussed below.

The rejection of claims 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over GUYURON in view of ABBER is maintained as discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 (Maintained)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 9, 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GUYURON (U.S. 6,471,985; Issued Oct. 29, 2002).

1. Guyuron discloses a method of treating a skin wound involving covering the wound with a room temperature vulcanizing (RTV) silicone composition comprising a crosslinkable polymer, and permitting the composition to cure to form a protective membrane (abstract; col. 2, lines 55-59). Guyuron teaches that the silicone composition is applied over the wound (col. 1, lines 7-9 and 54-56). Since an object of Guyuron's invention is to prevent infection of the wound (col. 1, lines 19-23 and 62-63; col. 2, lines

49 and 58), an ordinary artisan would understand Guyuron's teachings to mean that the silicone composition is applied over a wound, including the surrounding non-wounded skin as is typical of methods aiming to prevent infection by sealing a wound in order to prevent the entrance of bacteria or other contaminants. Guyuron teaches a method of applying the silicone composition (col. 1, lines 54-56; claims 1 and 21) by mixing a two-part composition, wherein both parts have a viscosity between 5 and 300 Pa•s (e.g. where the first part has a viscosity of about 60,000 to about 120,000 cps (equivalent to 60-120 Pa•s) while the second part has a viscosity from about 40,000 cps to about 100,000 cps (equivalent to 40-100 Pa•s)) (col. 10, lines 20-25). Guyuron further teaches that suitable polysiloxanes for the invention range in viscosity from about 0.01 Pa•s to 2500 Pa•s (col. 3, lines 19-26). It is noted that the preferred Formula I taught by Guyuron is a vinyl-substituted polydimethylsiloxane (col. 3, lines 30-65, particularly lines 64-65; claim 3), which is the same compound preferred in the instant application (paragraph [0019]). Thus, the preparation comprises a composition that is "highly viscous" according to the definition set forth in paragraph [0017] of the instant specification.

2. Furthermore, Guyuron teaches that the composition cures by means of crosslinking after application (col. 2, lines 1-9). The cured composition is a skin-friendly elastomer (claims 2 and 22) and adheres to the skin (col. 1, lines 59 and 60). Guyuron does not explicitly disclose the softness of the compositions in terms of the measurements defined in paragraphs [0041] and [0068] of the instant application. However, Guyuron teaches the amount of the crosslinkable polysiloxane component

varies depending on the desired physical properties of the RTV silicone composition (such as the desired uncured viscosity and cured hardness) (col. 4, lines 41-44). Additionally, Guyuron teaches that suitable wound dressings must stretch/flex to accommodate skin or bodily movement and that the compositions of the invention are flexible when cured (col. 1, lines 27-28; col. 10, lines 48-49). It is well within the purview of the ordinary artisan to adjust the amount of the crosslinkable polysiloxane component, as taught by Guyuron depending on the desired physical properties of the composition, both cured and uncured. Since Guyuron teaches that the uncured composition has a viscosity that meets the limitations of being "highly viscous" according to the instant specification, and teaches a final cured preparation that is flexible to skin and body movements, it is likely that the compositions of Guyuron meet this limitation as well. However, in the absence of an explicit teaching of the softness of the composition, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to the ordinary artisan to optimize the softness by adjusting the amount of crosslinkable polysiloxane and other components as taught by Guyuron. One would have been motivated to produce a final cured elastomeric preparation that is flexible since Guyuron teaches that such a property is necessary in these types of wound dressings, and such a composition would meet the limitation of "soft" according to the instant specification. Thus, the teachings of Guyuron render claim 9 obvious. Guyuron teaches applying the preparation in a thickness from about 0.1 mm to about 5 mm (abstract; col. 2, lines 7-8; claim 1), rendering claim 10 obvious.

3. Regarding claim 14, Guyuron teaches applying silicone composition by covering the wound to form a protective membrane (abstract; col. 2, lines 55-59; claim 1). Guyuron teaches that the silicone composition is applied over the wound (col. 1, lines 7-9 and 54-56). An ordinary artisan would understand Guyuron's teachings to mean that the silicone composition is applied over a wound, including the surrounding non-wounded skin as is typical of methods aiming to prevent infection by sealing a wound in order to prevent the entrance of bacteria or other contaminants. Moreover, it is well within the skill of an ordinary artisan to determine the precise amount and pattern of application optimal for a particular wound depending on the shape and nature of the wound. Thus, it would be *prima facie* obvious to an ordinary artisan to apply Guyuron's preparation over a wound and around the outside edge of a wound in the range of 2-100 mm as is typical with other liquid bandages, ointments, and topical treatments known in the art.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. (*In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA) 1976). In light of the forgoing discussion, the examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a). From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the invention

as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the preparation should not be applied to a wound (response, p. 7-8). Applicants argue that Guyuron's preparation is not applied to the skin around a wound (response, p. 8).

In response to applicants' argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the exclusion of the composition from the wound) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicants' amendments have been acknowledged. However it is noted that even in the case that the composition is applied directly to a wound, such a method still reads on the claims so long as it is obvious to apply it to the non-wounded skin surrounding the wound as well. Such is the case with Guyuron's method as discussed *supra*. If even a small portion of Guyuron's composition touches the skin in addition to the wound, Guyuron reads on the claims. Given that the original claims recited skin and not a wound, *per se*, the examiner interpreted the claims to mean the non-wounded skin around a wound in the prior Office action, and applied art accordingly. Thus, the amendments do not distinguish the claimed invention over Guyuron.

It is clear that Guyuron's composition would be applied to the non-wounded skin surrounding a wound as well as to the wound itself because Guyuron intends to prevent infection of the wound (col. 1, lines 19-23 and 62-63; col. 2, lines 49 and 58), by blocking the entrance of bacteria or other contaminants (col. 11, lines18-20). If, as applicants suggest, Guyuron's composition were applied only to wounded tissue, and no part of it touched non-wounded skin, there would be at least some amount of wounded tissue left unprotected between the composition and the non-wounded skin. This situation would allow for the entrance of bacteria and other contaminants, which is contrary to the object of Guyuron's invention, as would be recognized by the ordinary artisan.

Applicants argue that there is no indication in Guyuron that the composition adheres to the skin.

Guyuron teaches that the composition adequately adheres to a wound (col. 1, lines 59 and 60) and that the composition can adhere to rubber gloves. An ordinary artisan would have a reasonable expectation that the elastomer disclosed by Guyuron also adheres to skin. Indeed, the disclosure of Guyuron suggests adherence to skin since, as discussed above, the composition is intended to be applied over a wound to cover the wound, and would necessarily contact non-wounded skin in the process. No evidence has been presented to demonstrate that Guyuron's composition does not adhere to skin. Rather, it is noted that the composition of Guyuron is substantially identical to that instantly claimed, and therefore must have the same properties.

Applicants argue that since Guyuron teaches the use of release agents, Guyuron

teaches away from having articles adhering to the composition (response, p. 9).

Applicants present this argument with respect to the rejection of claims 9, 10, and 14, over Guyuron. However, nothing in claims 9, 10, or 14 requires the addition of an article to the adhesive composition. Thus, this argument does not apply to these claims. The claims stand rejected as obvious over Guyuron.

Claims 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guyuron in view of ABBER (U.S. 4,925,671; Issued May 15, 1990).

4. Guyuron renders obvious the method of claims 9, 10, and 14, as discussed above. Guyuron teaches that the silicone composition may be custom fit to any contoured or shaped surface. Guyuron also teaches that the compositions should be used in conjunction with a release agent when other objects are used to apply the composition (col. 10, lines 41-46). Guyuron teaches that the composition is preferably adherent for about 30-45 minutes after mixing the components, but that full curing may not occur for several hours or days (col. 10, lines 34-58). Thus, the ordinary artisan would readily recognize that the composition of Guyuron would be adhesive for some time after application, and would adhere to a variety of surfaces. While clearly teaching that the composition is suitable as an adhesive, Guyuron does not teach the use of the composition as an adhesive for other medical articles *per se*.

5. However, use of similar silicone compositions for this exact purpose was well known in the art at the time of the invention. For example, Abber discloses pressure sensitive adhesives comprising silicones including crosslinked vinyl-substituted dimethyl

siloxanes (col. 4, lines 37-43; col. 7, lines 35-39). It is noted that these compositions have viscosities of about 20 Pa•s (col. 4, lines 37-43) and are therefore "highly viscous" according to the instant specification. These compositions are intended for use as adhesives for various medical devices (abstract; col. 1, line 11-16; claims 1-4). Since Guyuron suggests that the composition can adhere to articles in addition to wounds and human skin, an ordinary artisan would readily have envisioned the use of the compositions taught by Guyuron as adhesives for a variety of medical devices as taught by Abber. Such a use amounts to combining known prior art elements (i.e. crosslinked silicone compositions) according to known methods (i.e. use of as these compositions as adhesives for medical devices) to yield predictable results (i.e. acceptable adhesion of the medical devices to the skin). The ordinary artisan would have had a high expectation of success in doing so since the prior art establishes that substantially identical compositions are useful for exactly the same purpose and since Guyuron suggests such a use. Thus, the combined teachings of Guyuron and Abber render claims 11 and 19 obvious.

6. Regarding claim 12, Abber teaches the application of the adhesive to a medical device (col. 1, lines 35-37 and 45-47; col. 4, lines 17-22). Thus, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to an ordinary artisan to apply the preparation of Guyuron to the article before applying it to the skin (see the above discussion of claim 11). After doing so, placing the article to the skin would be applying the preparation to the skin at the same time as the article (i.e. applying them concurrently). Thus, the combined teachings of Guyuron and Abber render claim 12 obvious.

7. Regarding claims 13 and 20, it is noted that Guyuron teaches a composition that is substantially identical to that which is instantly claimed. Thus, it is the examiner's position that the composition of Guyuron is also "designed such that its adherence to the article for medical use is greater than its adherence to skin after curing." Indeed, such is suggested by Guyuron since a release agent is required when using the composition with articles other than skin (col. 10, lines 41-46), whereas the dressings of Guyuron possess releasability (e.g. they can be removed by gently peeling them off the skin) (col. 11, lines 50-53), enabling non-damaging removal from a wound (col. 1, lines 59-62). Furthermore, Abber teaches that the silicone adhesive of the invention are particularly suited to medical applications since it is easily removed from the skin, but has a high degree of adhesion over a prolonged period. Thus, even if the composition taught by Guyuron did not meet this limitation, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to design the composition to have these qualities per the teachings of Guyuron and Abber, rendering claims 13 and 20 obvious. Abber teaches that pressure-sensitive adhesives for use on human skin are used typically in bandages or other therapeutic devices which must adhere to the skin for a prescribed period of time and teach that the adhesive of the invention is useful for this purpose (col. 1, lines 18-21; col. 4, lines 64-66). Thus, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to an ordinary artisan to use the adhesive with a bandage (i.e. a wound dressing) or other medical device per the teachings of Abber, rendering claim 15 obvious.

8. Regarding claim 16, Abber teaches the use of the adhesive in conjunction with bandages such as transdermal therapeutic devices (abstract; col. 2, lines 63-68). Abber

describes some types of transdermal devices used with the adhesive as having semi-permeable layers with respect to the drug in the transdermal device (col. 1, lines 48-50; col. 4, lines 60-64), but clearly states that the adhesives have general applicability to essentially any transdermal device which must be adhesively placed in contact with the skin (col. 5, lines 4-10). It is noted that the instant specification defines a liquid-tight dressing as merely having one layer that is liquid-tight (paragraph [0026]). Transdermal devices comprising at least one liquid-tight layer are well known in the art. An ordinary artisan would be motivated to use such a liquid-tight device in conjunction with the silicone adhesives taught by Guyuron because Guyuron teaches that the compositions act as barriers to retain moisture in the wound (col. 10, lines 63-65; col. 11, lines 16-18). Thus, to maintain such a moisture retentive property of a wound dressing, one would select a liquid-tight wound dressing for use with this adhesive, rendering claim 16 obvious. This is especially true with Guyuron, since Guyuron does not teach that the compositions are completely water impermeable.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. (*In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA) 1976). In light of the forgoing discussion, the examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a). From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the invention

as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicants argue that since Guyuron teaches the use of release agents, Guyuron teaches away from having articles adhering to the composition. Applicants further argue that there is not suggestion that that Guyuron's composition is suitable as an adhesive (response, p. 9).

It was acknowledged in the prior Office action that Guyuron does not teach the use of the composition as an adhesive for medical articles *per se* (see top of p. 9). However, as discussed above, an artisan would certainly have had a high expectation that Guyuron's composition could successfully be used as a suitable adhesive. For example, Guyuron teaches that the composition is preferably adherent for about 30-45 minutes after mixing the components, but that full curing may not occur for several hours or days (col. 10, lines 34-58). Thus, the ordinary artisan would readily recognize that the composition of Guyuron would be adhesive for some time after application, and would adhere to a variety of surfaces. Furthermore, Abber was relied upon to show that similar compositions were known and used for the same purpose as instantly claimed.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.

1986).

Regarding applicants' assertion that Guyuron teaches away from the claimed process, the MPEP states, Furthermore, "[t]he prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a teaching away from any of these alternatives because such disclosure does not criticize, discredit, or otherwise discourage the solution claimed...." *In re Fulton*, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). See MPEP § 2123. In this case, Guyuron teaches the use of the composition as a membrane covering a wound, but Guyuron does not state that the composition *must only* be used alone as suggested by applicants (see col. 11, lines 61-64). Accordingly, Guyuron does not teach away from the instantly claimed process.

Applicants argue that Abber is silent as to the viscosity of the final adhesive and that Abber does not teach the use of the composition as a protective barrier (response, p. 10).

Applicants are reminded that Guyuron teaches an adhesive silicone composition that is substantially identical to the instantly claimed composition. Guyuron teaches the viscosity and protective barrier characteristics of the composition as discussed above. Abber is relied upon to show that similar silicone compositions were known in the art to be useful adhesives for medical devices. The examiner did not suggest that the composition of Abber would be used in the method of Guyuron's invention. Rather, it was stated that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Guyuron's own composition as an adhesive for medical devices as taught by Abber, to provide a suitable adhesive for a medical device

(see middle to end of p. 9).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicants argue Abber teaches away from the combination with Guyuron (response, p. 10).

It is noted that while Guyuron teaches an advantage of the composition is to retain moisture in the wound, this teaching does not mean that the composition of Guyuron is necessarily completely liquid impermeable as implied by applicants. Guyuron does not teach that the barrier is completely liquid impermeable. Rather Guyuron teaches that the composition helps to retain moisture in the wound, and that this property depends upon the thickness of the composition applied (col. 10, lines 63-65). Thus, Guyuron suggests that some degree of liquid permeability is inherent to the composition, and that this characteristic can be adjusted by altering the thickness of the composition applied to the wound. The permeability of the final composition would be selected by the artisan based on the precise application and nature of the wound to be treated covered. Thus, Abber does not teach away from Guyuron. It is further noted that it is not the use of Abber's composition in Guyuron's invention that has been suggested, but that directly taught by Guyuron. All that is required of Abber to cure the deficiency of Guyuron is the explicit teaching that silicone-based adhesives can be used

in combination with medical devices, which is clearly provided as discussed above.

Summary/Conclusion

Claims 9-16, 19, and 20 are rejected.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin S. Orwig whose telephone number is (571)270-5869. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday 7:00 am-4:00 pm (with alternate Fridays off). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila Landau can be reached Monday-Friday 8:00 am-5:00 pm at (571)272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KSO

/David J Blanchard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643